MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 12, 1929.

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1929 was held in the office of McKim, Mead and White, 101 Park Avenue, New York City, on Tuesday, February 12, 1929.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Garfield,
Mr. Vitale,
Mr. Cross,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

There was also present, at the request of the Chairman, Mr. James E. Fraser, in the absence of the sculptor member Mr. Taft. Also Lieut.Col. U.S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, Major J. C. Mehaffey, Assistant, and Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall, representing the architects, of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m.

1. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE, Elimination of Diagonal Roadways from 23d and B Street, and from the Ericsson Memorial to the Lincoln Memorial and Bridge Plaza: Major Mehaffey stated that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had recommended the elimination of the diagonal road from 23d and B Street and from the Ericsson Memorial to the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plaza.

The Commission inspected the design, and said they could not explain why these roadways appeared on the plans and agreed to the elimination of them. A sketch was submitted by Major Mehaffey, marked Scheme 3, which Colonel Grant said solves the problem, and this was favored by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission endorsed the plan.

A discussion followed as to treating the great Plaza. Mr. Kendall said

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 12, 1929.

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1929 was held in the office of McKim, Mead and White, 101 Park Avenue, New York City, on Tuesday, February 12, 1929.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Gerfield,
Mr. Vitale,
Mr. Cross,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

There was also present, at the request of the Chairman, Mr. James E. Fraser, in the absence of the acting member Mr. Taft. Also Lieut.Col. U.S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, Major J. C. Mohaffey, Assistant, and Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall, representing the Architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m.

1. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE. Elimination of Diagonal Roadways from 23d and B Street, and from the Ericsson Memorial to the Lincoln Memorial and Bridge Plaza: Major Mohaffey stated that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had recommended the elimination of the diagonal road from 23d and B Street and from the Ericsson Memorial to the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plaza.

The Commission inspected the design, and said they could not explain why these roadways appeared on the plans and agreed to the elimination of them. A sketch was submitted by Major Mohaffey, marked Scheme B, which Colonel Grant said solves the problem, and this was favored by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission endorsed the plan.

A discussion followed as to treating the great Plaza. Mr. Kendall said

the original design showed a fountain in the center of the Plaza, but that this was objected to by Mr. Bacon because of its interference with the view of the Lincoln Memorial. The Commission felt that two sprays of water, similar to those of the "Rainbow Fountain" along Seventeenth Street on the axis of the Lincoln Memorial, was appropriate, or also a tapis verde, which Mr. Vitale said, always gives repose to a scene.

Major Mehaffey submitted a Grading Plan for the Plaza, which he said eliminates the "dish", objected to in the original plans, and meets the requirements of the Plaza. The Commission felt that this Grading Plan was acceptable and approved it.

Circle at End of B Street: Major Mehaffey called attention to the Circle proposed at the end of B Street, and said the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission would like to see it omitted, as it is regarded unnecessary and would interfere seriously with traffic coming down New Hampshire Avenue via the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway,--that there ought to be"a clean sweep" from the Parkway to the Bridge.

Mr. Moore said a year or two ago the Greek Legation informed the Commission that citizens of Athens were planning to give a column of the Temple of Jupiter to the United States, and that the proposed Circle at the end of B Street was suggested as a site by the Commission; that the gift requires the consent of Congress and no effort appears to have been made to secure it.

The Commission did not regard the Circle absolutely necessary as a terminal motive for B Street. Mr. Kendall submitted a sketch, showing a semi-circular bend in the river wall, which would allow for a sculptural

the original design showed a fountain in the center of the Plans, but that this was objected to by Mr. Bacon because of its interference with the view of the Lincoln Memorial. The Commission felt that two sprays of water, similar to those of the "Rainbow Fountain" along Seventeenth Street on the axis of the Lincoln Memorial, was appropriate, or also a tapis verde, which Mr. Vitale said, always gives repose to a scene.

Major Meharffey submitted a Grading Plan for the Plans, which he said eliminates the "dish", objected to in the original plans, and meets the requirements of the Plans. The Commission felt that this Grading Plan was acceptable and approved it.

Circle at End of B Street: Major Meharffey called attention to the Circle proposed at the end of B Street, and said the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission would like to see it omitted, as it is regarded unnecessary and would interfere seriously with traffic coming down New Hampshire Avenue via the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway,--that there ought to be a clean sweep from the Parkway to the Bridge.

Mr. Moore said a year or two ago the Greek Legation informed the Commission that citizens of Athens were planning to give a column of the Temple of Jupiter to the United States, and that the proposed Circle at the end of B Street was suggested as a site by the Commission; that the gift requires the consent of Congress and no effort appears to have been made to secure it.

The Commission did not regard the Circle absolutely necessary as a terminal motive for B Street. Mr. Kendall submitted a sketch, showing a semi-circular bend in the river wall, which would allow for a sculptural

figure or other motive at the end of B Street off from the Rock Creek Parkway. The Commission favored its adoption.

Lee Highway Connection with the Arlington Memorial Bridge: Major Mehaffey said the Lee Highway Association desires to know just where their roadway would connect with the Arlington Memorial Bridge on Columbia Island Plaza, and submitted a sketch plan prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission showing that they suggested a skew bridge and connecting roadway extending northwest from the Bridge end on Columbia Island.

Mr. Vitale called attention to the original plan of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, showing the diverging roadways proposed at the time of the adoption of the plans, running from the center of the Bridge end on Columbia Island north a short distance to a small circle, and there connect with the Lee Highway; similarly southward, to connect with the Mount Vernon Boulevard. Mr. Vitale said this plan should be adhered to, with such modification as may be necessary, but using the original plan as a basis. The question arose as to how far north the diverging roadway should extend. The Commission felt that this should be made the subject of study by Mr. Kendall.

Pavement of the Underpass Road: Major Mehaffey submitted a plan showing the proposed treatment of the pavement of the Underpass Road at the foot of the Water Gate. Col. Grant said that to put in a granite paving would be very costly, since it would be necessary to put in piling, fill and trestle work, so as to keep the granite smooth; whereas, if Belgian blocks and asphalt be used, as he would recommend, this could be treated as most roadways and could be easily repaired.

The Commission did not consider it of extreme importance to have granite for this roadway, and approved the plan to use asphalt pavement and Belgian blocks.

figure or other motive at the end of B Street off from the Rock Creek Parkway.

The Commission favored its adoption.

Lee Highway Connection with the Arlington Memorial Bridge: Major Merrifield said the Lee Highway Association desires to know just where their roadway would connect with the Arlington Memorial Bridge on Columbia Island Plaza, and submitted a sketch plan prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission showing that they suggested a skew bridge and connecting roadway extending northwest from the Bridge end on Columbia Island.

Mr. Vitale called attention to the original plan of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, showing the diverging roadways proposed at the time of the adoption of the plans, running from the center of the Bridge end on Columbia Island north a short distance to a small circle, and there connect with the Lee Highway; similarly southward, to connect with the Mount Vernon Boulevard. Mr. Vitale said this plan should be adhered to, with such modification as may be necessary, but using the original plan as a basis. The question arose as to how far north the diverging roadway should extend. The Commission felt that this should be made the subject of study by Mr. Kendall.

Pavement of the Underpass Road: Major Merrifield submitted a plan showing the proposed treatment of the pavement of the Underpass Road at the foot of the Water Gate. Col. Grant said that to put in a granite paving would be very costly, since it would be necessary to put in piling, fill and trestle work, so as to keep the granite smooth; whereas, if Belgian blocks and asphalt be used, as he would recommend, this could be treated as most roadways and could be easily repaired.

The Commission did not consider it of extreme importance to have granite for this roadway, and approved the plan to use asphalt pavement and Belgian blocks,

in appropriate geometric design. Mr. Kendall said he would agree to this, as it did not affect the design of the Arlington Memorial Bridge in a material way.

Sculpture for the Arlington Memorial Bridge: Col. Grant said it was about time to take up the question of sculptors for the sculptural groups at the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plaza at the Lincoln Memorial, and that it would be necessary to have a competition, because Congress had allowed only $250,000 to be expended without competition and this amount has been fully obligated; also, Colonel Grant said, that certain rulings of the Comptroller General pertaining to the Arlington Memorial Bridge made it necessary to have this competition.

The Commission discussed the matter, and decided that all sculptors invited to this competition should be paid for their work. The Commission decided they would recommend the following sculptors for this competition:

Mr. French,
Mr. Adams,
Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Friedlander,
Mr. Lee Lawrie,
Mr. Jennewein.
Mr. Weinman, unless appointed a member of the Commission;

Colonel Grant said in the case of competitions, the designs for which payment is made by the Government become the property of the United States; and that there have been instances where this has been found possible; he raised the question whether these sculptors would give their designs to the Government. The Commission felt this could be adjusted with the sculptors, and recommended that a draft of the competition be prepared. (Exhibit A).

2. "LINDBERGH MEDAL": Mrs. Fraser submitted a model for the obverse of the Lindbergh Medal, showing the head of Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh in the garb of an aviator. Mrs. Fraser said it is proposed to make the medal three

in appropriate geometric design. Mr. Kendall said he would agree to this, as it did not affect the design of the Arlington Memorial Bridge in a material way.

Sculpture for the Arlington Memorial Bridge: Col. Grant said it was about time to take up the question of sculptors for the sculptural groups at the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plans at the Lincoln Memorial, and that it would be necessary to have a competition, because Congress had allowed only $250,000 to be expended without competition and this amount has been fully obligated; also, Colonel Grant said, that certain rulings of the Comptroller General pertaining to the Arlington Memorial Bridge made it necessary to have this competition.

The Commission discussed the matter, and decided that all sculptors invited to this competition should be paid for their work. The Commission decided they would recommend the following sculptors for this competition:

Mr. French,	Mr. Friedlander,
Mr. Adams,	Mr. Lee Lawrie,
Mr. Fraser,	Mr. Jennewein.
Mr. Weinman, unless appointed a member of the Commission;	

Colonel Grant said in the case of competitions, the designs for which payment is made by the Government become the property of the United States; and that there have been instances where this has been found possible; he raised the question whether these sculptors would give their designs to the Government. The Commission felt this could be adjusted with the sculptors, and recommended that a draft of the competition be prepared. (Exhibit A).

2. "LINDBERGH MEDAL": Mr. Fraser submitted a model for the obverse of the Lindbergh Medal, showing the head of Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh in the garb of an aviator. Mr. Fraser said it is proposed to make the medal three

inches in diameter; that the lettering shown in the model will come down in relief. For the reverse there will be a flying figure, heretofore inspected and endorsed by the Commission.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the excellence of the work, but felt that Lindbergh's face should be strengthened so as to give it a less feminine appearance. The Commission also suggested reducing somewhat the horizontal letters---Congress of the United States--so as to make them less conspicuous. The Commission approved the design with these suggestions.

Mrs. Fraser said she regretted that Colonel Lindbergh had not granted her an hour's sitting, so as to get a good profile of him; that in the absence of it she had to use prints that were not satisfactory.

Mr. Moore said that the Secretary of the Treasury had requested the head of Lindbergh be shown on the medal and that every effort was made to get Colonel Lindbergh to respond to the request for this appointment but without success

3. ADDITIONAL INSCRIPTION FOR THE STATUE OF LINCOLN: Mr. Moore said he had received the following letter from Mr. Daniel Chester French, recommending, in behalf of Piccirilli Brothers, that their name appear on the statue for transposing the model into stone:

February 1, 1929.

> "In talking with Mr. Getulio Piccirilli the other day, he expressed the earnest wish that the name of Piccirilli might appear on the statue of Lincoln in the Lincoln Memorial, to perpetuate the name of his father. As you know, the transposing of that statue into marble was a very unusual feat and I do not wonder that the Piccirilli Brothers are proud of it; and I, personally, would be very glad to have the record placed on it that they were responsible for the carving of it.
>
> I appreciate that other workers on the Lincoln Memorial might claim an equal right to credit for the work that they did, but I feel as if the Piccirilli had a sort of prior claim. Do you imagine that the "Powers that be" would consider the possibility of granting this request? Please give it your thought."

inches in diameter; that the lettering shown in the model will come down in relief. For the reverse there will be a flying figure, heretofore inspected and endorsed by the Commission.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the excellence of the work, but felt that Lindbergh's face should be strengthened so as to give it a less feminine appearance. The Commission also suggested reducing somewhat the horizontal letters---Congress of the United States--so as to make them less conspicuous. The Commission approved the design with these suggestions.

Mrs. Fraser said she regretted that Colonel Lindbergh had not granted her an hour's sitting, so as to get a good profile of him; that in the absence of it she had to use prints that were not satisfactory.

Mr. Moore said that the Secretary of the Treasury had requested the head of Lindbergh be shown on the medal and that every effort was made to get Colonel Lindbergh to respond to the request for this appointment but without success.

3. ADDITIONAL INSCRIPTION FOR THE STATUE OF LINCOLN: Mr. Moore said he had received the following letter from Mr. Daniel Chester French, recommending, in behalf of Piccirilli Brothers, that their name appear on the statue for transposing the model into stone:

February 1, 1929.

"In talking with Mr. Getulio Piccirilli the other day, he expressed the earnest wish that the name of Piccirilli might appear on the statue of Lincoln in the Lincoln Memorial, to perpetuate the name of his father. As you know, the transposing of that statue into marble was a very unusual feat and I do not wonder that the Piccirilli Brothers are proud of it; and I, personally, would be very glad to have the record placed on it that they were responsible for the carving of it.

I appreciate that other workers on the Lincoln Memorial might claim an equal right to credit for the work that they did, but I feel as if the Piccirilli had a sort of prior claim. Do you imagine that the "Powers that be" would consider the possibility of granting this request? Please give it your thought."

The Commission felt there should be no objection to this request, and altogether favored it; that the inscription could be placed on the back of the statue. Colonel Grant agreed that it would be appropriate to have this done. Mr. French was informed accordingly (Exhibit B).

4. WRIGHT MEMORIAL, KITTY HAWK, N. C.: Under date of February 9, 1929, the following letter was received from Major General B. F. Cheatham, the Quartermaster General, U. S. A., with which he submitted a design for the proposed Wright Memorial, at Kitty Hawk, N. C.:

> "The Jury of Award for the competition for the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, has submitted its report to me, and I take pleasure in enclosing a copy for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts.
>
> You will find the act of Congress requiring the approval of the Commission quoted in the program for the competition, a copy of which is enclosed herewith. I request the decision of the Commission upon the entire suitability of the designs for the purpose intended. A copy of the designer's conception of the symbolism of his plan for the monument is also enclosed. The designs themselves in five (5) drawings are forwarded to you under separate cover in connection with this letter. You will note that in accordance with the instructions of the Cabinet Commission, under which I am acting, and as clearly shown in the program, the memorial is to consist of two separate parts, first a building for the Coast Guard of a utilitarian character and with no special architectural features, to be located on the beach, and secondly, a monument in the form of a light tower to be located on the top of Kill Devil Hill. It is only the latter which gives a chance to the designer to express himself.
>
> The name of the author of the winning design is held confidential and has not been released for publication inasmuch as final selection rests in the hands of the Cabinet Commission.
>
> Such reasonably expeditious decision as the Fine Arts Commission finds possible to give me will be much appreciated, as it will assist in advancing the date of final and definite selection of the design."

A copy of the report of the Jury of Award, and a description of the design, number 7, are attached hereto (Exhibit C)

The Commission inspected the drawings. The Commission, after consideration

The Commission felt there should be no objection to this request, and altogether favored it; that the inscription could be placed on the back of the statue. Colonel Grant agreed that it would be appropriate to have this done. Mr. Pierson was informed accordingly (Exhibit b).

4. [illegible] KITTY HAWK, N. C.: Under date of February 9, 1929, the following letter was received from Major General B. F. Cheatham, the Quartermaster General, U. S. A., with which he submitted a design for the proposed Wright Memorial, at Kitty Hawk, N. C.:

"The Jury of Award for the competition for the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, has submitted its report to me, and I take pleasure in enclosing a copy for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts.

You will find the act of Congress requiring the approval of the Commission quoted in the program for the competition, a copy of which is enclosed herewith. I request the decision of the Commission upon the artistic suitability of the design for the purpose intended. A copy of the designer's conception of the symbolism of his plan for the monument is also enclosed. The designs themselves in five (5) drawings are forwarded to you under separate cover in connection with this letter. You will note that in accordance with the instructions of the Bronze Commission, under which I am acting, and as clearly shown in the program, the memorial is to consist of two separate parts, first a building for the Coast Guard of a utilitarian character and with no special architectural features, to be located on the beach, and secondly, a monument in the form of a light tower to be located on the top of Kill Devil Hill. It is only the latter which gives a chance to the designer to express himself.

The name of the author of the winning design is held confidential and has not been released for publication [illegible] on final selection rests in the hands of the Cabinet Commission.

Such reasonably expeditious decision as the Fine Arts Commission finds possible to give me will be much appreciated, as it will assist in advancing the date of final and definite selection of the design."

A copy of the report of the Jury of Award, and a description of the design, number 7, are attached hereto (Exhibit c)

The Commission inspected the drawings. The Commission, after consideration

decided that the design (Number 7), showing a Light Tower, would be suitable for the Wright Memorial, and recommended its acceptance as being appropriate for the purpose intended.

The Commission recommended also that the architect confer with the Commission as to the design, with a view to simplification of certain features of it, pertaining to the top of the tower, and to the pavement--the star-shaped design of the pavement was not favored.

The design for the Coast Guard Station was inspected, and the Commission were well pleased with it; the acceptance of the design was recommended, with the suggestion that the architect give further study to the cupola. Mr. Garfield said a cupola is one of the most difficult objects in architecture to design; usually it is too large or too small,--in this case it seems too large.

A report was made to the Quartermaster General (Exhibit C-1).

5. PEARY MEMORIAL: Under date of January 15, 1929, a letter was received by Mr. Moore from Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, President of the National Geographic Society(Exhibit D), submitting a landscape plan prepared by Mr. O. C. Simonds, of Simonds and West, Landscape Designers, 1101 Buena Avenue, Chicago, for the landscape treatment of the proposed new site of the Admiral Peary Memorial, at the south end of the Arlington National Cemetery, near the Coast Guard Memorial.

The plan had been submitted to Mr. Vitale, who advised that it would not be appropriate for Arlington as designed, and disapproved it. Simplification of the design is necessary. Mr. Moore thought possibly it would be best first to relocate the monument, and then agree on the landscape treatment. Dr.Grosvenor was informed accordingly (Exhibit D-1).

6. HENRY CLAY STATUE, landscape plan: Mr. Edmond T. Quinn, sculptor for the Henry Clay statue was present, and presented a sketch for a new location

decided that the design (Number 7), showing a light tower, would be suitable for the Bright Memorial, and recommended its acceptance as being appropriate for the purpose intended.

The Commission recommended also that the architect confer with the Commission as to the design, with a view to simplification of certain features of it, pertaining to the top of the tower, and to the pavement--the star-shaped design of the pavement was not favored.

The design for the Count Sturd Station was inspected, and the Commission were well pleased with it; the acceptance of the design was recommended, with the suggestion that the architect give further study to the cupola. Mr. Carlton said a cupola is one of the most difficult objects in architecture to design; usually it is too large or too small,--in this case it seems too large.

A report was made to the Postmaster General (Exhibit C-1).

5. PUBLIC PARKING: Under date of January 10, 1939, a letter was received by Mr. Moore from Mr. Gilbert Grosvenor, President of the National Geographic Society(Exhibit D), submitting a Landscape plan prepared by Mr. O. C. Simonds of Simonds and Nast, Landscape Engineers, 1101 Tower Avenue, Chicago, for the Landscape treatment of the proposed new site of the Admiral Peary Memorial, at the south end of the Arlington National Cemetery, near the Count Sturd Memorial.

The plan had been submitted to Mr. Vitale, who advised that it would not be appropriate for Arlington as designed, and disapproved it. Simplification of the design is necessary. Mr. Moore thought possibly it would be best first to relocate the monument, and then agree on the landscape treatment. Mr. Grosvenor was informed accordingly (Exhibit D-1).

6. HENRY CLAY STATUE, Landscape plan: Mr. Edward C. Quinn, sculptor for the Henry Clay statue was present, and presented a sketch for a new location

of the Henry Clay statue in the plaza assigned at Caracas, so as to be at the edge of the Henry Clay Plaza,--the new site having been suggested by Mr. Sterner, architect of the memorial, who was prevented from being present on account of illness.

The plan was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Vitale, who said the new site would be an inferior spot to the one indicated in the original plot plan of the plaza and advised adhering to it. The Commission endorsed the recommendation. Mr. Quinn said he was very glad to hear this, as the original plan gives the statue a central position in the plaza.

7. FREER GALLERY OF ART, PLAN FOR FENCE: Under date of January 29, 1929, the following letter was received from Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator, of the Freer Gallery of Art, together with a plan prepared by Mr. Charles A. Platt, Architect, for a fence to enclose the Freer Gallery:

"My dear Mr. Moore:

The accompanying blue print shows Mr. Platt's design for the proposed fence around the Freer Gallery. I understand that such plans must receive the approval of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks and of the Commission of Fine Arts before they can be carried into effect, and so I begin by submitting them to you. Personally, I think the design is excellent and can assure you that if the fence is set up it will add greatly to the peace and quiet of the Freer Gallery by keeping innumerable children and others away from the immediate vicinity of the building.

Trusting that you will let me know what further steps I should take in order to secure the necessary official sanction as soon as possible, I am

Sincerely yours,
J. E. Lodge, Curator."

The plan was submitted to Mr. Vitale, who said that it was excellent and approved it. The Commission inspected the plan. Mr. Moore said that the Commission had heretofore considered the plan in relation to the Mall Development and had interposed no objection to the fence if the grounds within the fence would be treated as a garden. Attention was called to the fence enclosing the

of the Henry Clay statue in the plaza assigned at Harper's to be at the edge of the Henry Clay Plaza.--the new site having been suggested by Mr. Pierson, architect of the memorial, who was prevented from being present on account of illness.

The plan was brought to the participular attention of Mr. Vitale, who said the new site would be an inferior spot to the one indicated in the original plot plan of the plaza and advised adhering to it. The Commission endorsed the recommendation. Mr. Quinn said he was very glad to hear this, as the original plan gives the statue a central position in the plaza.

7. Freer Gallery of Art, Mall from Madison: Under date of January 29, 1923, the following letter was received from Mr. John A. Lodge, Chairman, of the Freer Gallery of Art, together with a plan prepared by Mr. Charles A. Platt, Architect, for a fence to enclose the Freer Gallery:

"My dear Mr. Moore:

The accompanying blue print shows Mr. Platt's design for the proposed fence around the Freer Gallery. I understand that such plans must receive the approval of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks and of the Commission of Fine Arts before they can be carried into effect, and so I begin by submitting them to you. Personally, I think the design is excellent and can assure you that if the fence is set up it will add greatly to the peace and quiet of the Freer Gallery by keeping innumerable children and others away from the immediate vicinity of the building.

Trusting that you will let me know what further steps I should take in order to secure the necessary official sanction as soon as possible, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. A. Lodge, Chairman."

The plan was submitted to Mr. Vitale, who said that it was excellent and approved it. The Commission inspected the plan. Mr. Moore said that the Commission had heretofore considered the plan in relation to the Mall Development and had interposed no objection to the fence if the grounds within the fence would be treated as a garden. Attention was called to the fence enclosing the

Luxemburg in Paris with its garden. The Commission felt it would be desirable to have this fence if similarly the enclosure were treated as a garden. With this recommendation, the design was approved (Exhibit E).

Colonel Grant said he did not think there would be any objection to the fence as proposed, adjacent to the Mall, if it was serving a useful purpose.

8. WORLD WAR MEMORIAL AT TOURS, FRANCE: Mr. James E. Mangum, Chief Clerk of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitted the following letter with regard to the model prepared by Mr. C. Paul Jennewein, 538 Van Nest Avenue, The Bronx, New York, for the proposed World War Memorial at Tours, France, which is to be a fountain:

February 11, 1929.

"Referring to your letter of February 10, 1928, concerning the Memorial to be erected at Tours, France, we have to advise that a 3/4" scale model of this monument has been prepared by Mr. C. P. Jennewein, Sculptor, in collaboration with the Architect, Mr. Arthur Loomis Harmon.

This model (a photograph of which is enclosed) is now in the studio of Mr. Jennewein, 538 Van Nest Avenue, New York City, and it is understood that your Commission will inspect it there.---

The American Battle Monuments Commission has approved the design of this Memorial in principle and would appreciate your fullest comments and recommendations relative thereto."

The Commission, including Mr. Fraser, inspected the model at the studio of Mr. Jennewein. The Commission regarded it excellent in design, but a number of suggestions were made to the sculptor and to the architect by the members of the Commission, with a view to simplification. The design showed four figures (to be 6½ feet high) above the bowl, and eight figures below it, suggesting the various Services of Supply of the American Army during the World War, which the memorial is to commemorate, as Administration, Construction, Procurement, and Distribution. A suggestion submitted by Dr. Paul Cret, Consulting Architect of the American Battle Monuments Commission, that the Seal of the United States and the Seal of France be omitted from among the insignia of the Services of Supply, was approved by the Commission.

France", which is to be a fountain:

February 11, 1919.

"Referring to your letter of February 10, 1919, concerning the Memorial to be erected at Tours, France, we have to advise that a 3/4" scale model of this monument has been prepared by Mr. C. L. Tenenwein, Sculptor, in collaboration with the Architect, Mr. Arthur Loomis Harmon.

This model (a photograph of which is enclosed) is now in the studio of Mr. Tenenwein, 1328 Van Nest Avenue, New York City, and it is requested that your Commission will inspect it there.---

The American Battle Monuments Commission has approved the design of this Memorial in principle and would appreciate your valued comments and recommendations relative thereto."

The Commission, including Mr. Fraser, inspected the model at the studio of Mr. Tenenwein. The Commission regarded it excellent in design, but a number of suggestions were made to the sculptor and to the architect by the members of the Commission, with a view to simplification. The design showed four figures (to be 8½ feet high) above the bowl, and eight figures below it, suggesting the various services of Supply of the American Army during the World War, which the memorial is to commemorate, as administration, Construction, Procurement, and Distribution. A suggestion submitted by Mr. Paul Cret, Consulting Architect of the American Battle Monuments Commission, that the Seal of the United States and the Seal of France be omitted from the insignia of the Service of Supply, was approved by the Commission.

Also the recommendation of Dr. Cret that the line of the brackets, supporting the four figures on the main shaft, be carried down to the base, was approved by the Commission. Mr. Fraser concurred in these changes, and made also other suggestions to the sculptor in matters of detail. Mr. Fraser said personally he would regard the Indian at the top of the memorial sufficient, without the eagle. They are to be in bronze 10 feet high. The fountain is to be 35 feet high, with the bowl having a diameter of 16 feet.

The Commission approved the model, subject to the recommendations made to the sculptor and the architect. (Exhibit F)

9. NEW JERSEY WORLD WAR MEMORIAL: Mr. James E. Mangum, Chief Clerk of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitted the following letter dated February 11, 1929, for a Memorial School Building proposed for erection by the State of New Jersey, at Verdun, France:

> "The Act creating the American Battle Monuments Commission provides that before any design or material for memorials is accepted by the Commission, it shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. We are therefore transmitting herewith photostats of the perspective and plot plan of a school building, which the New Jersey France Memorial Commission plans to erect at Verdun, France. This building will be a replica of the old barracks at Trenton, New Jersey, and will be maintained by the Municipality of Verdun as a school.
>
> These plans have been approved by the American Battle Monuments Commission and are forwarded for such comments and recommendations as the Commission of Fine Arts may wish to make."

The Commission inspected the prints submitted of the New Jerssey Barracks at Trenton. The Commission advised that it would be inappropriate to have a replica of the Trenton Barracks serve as a school building at Verdun. The large porch of the barracks would cause the building to be poorly lighted for school purposes. The gift of the New Jersey France Memorial Commission, however, commended itself to the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission suggested that a well-designed school building, with possibly a memorial tablet preferable to the design proposed.(Exhibit G)

by the Commission. Mr. Pierce concurred in these changes, and made also other suggestions to the sculptor in matters of detail. Mr. Pierce said personally he would prefer the Indian at the top of the memorial sufficient without the eagle. They are to be in bronze 12 feet high. The fountain is to be 32 feet high, with the bowl having a diameter of 16 feet.

The Commission approved the model, subject to the recommendations made to the sculptor and the architect. (Exhibit F)

9. MAY TERRY JONES NOT MUNICIPAL: Mr. Owen B. Augspurger, Chief Clerk of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitted the following letter dated February 11, 1929, for a memorial School building proposed for erection by the State of New Jersey, at Verdun, France:

> "The Act creating the American Battle Monuments Commission provides that before any design or material for memorials is accepted by the Commission, it shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. We are therefore transmitting herewith photostats of the perspective and plot plan of a school building, which the New Jersey France Memorial Commission plans to erect at Verdun, France. This building will be a replica of the old barracks at Trenton, New Jersey, and will be maintained by the Municipality of Verdun as a school.
>
> These plans have been approved by the American Battle Monuments Commission and are forwarded for such comment and recommendation as the Commission of Fine Arts may wish to make."

The Commission inspected the prints submitted of the New Jersey barracks at Trenton. The Commission advised that it would be inappropriate to have a replica of the Trenton barracks serve as a school building at Verdun. The large porch of the barracks would cause the building to be poorly lighted for school purposes. The gift of the New Jersey France Memorial Commission, however, commended itself to the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission suggested that a well-designed school building, with possibly a memorial tablet preferable to the design proposed.(Exhibit G)

10. SUCCESSOR TO MR. TAFT: The secretary reported that the term of service of Mr. Lorado Taft, sculptor member of the Commission, would expire on February 14, 1929, and asked if the Commission wished to suggest a successor at this meeting. The Commission, after consideration, decided to suggest to the President the appointment of Mr. Adolph A. Weinman, Sculptor.

11. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: The secretary asked if the Commission wished to meet in Washington during the period of the Inauguration of President Hoover. In view of the great crowd of people in Washington at the time, the Commission felt it inadvisable to meet during Inauguration Week, and decided to meet in Washington on Thursday, March 21, 1929.

The Commission had the pleasure of being the guests of Mr. Cross and ~~Mr. Vitale~~ at luncheon at the Links Club. In the evening the members and former members of the Commission, including a few guests, were the guests of Mr. Pope at the "Annual Dinner" of the Commission. It was a most delightful occasion. Those present were: Mr. Pope, Mr. Moore, Mr. Adams, Mr. Platt, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Wm. Sergeant Kendall, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Medary, Mr. Delano, Mr. Garfield, Mr. Vitale, Mr. Winter, Mr. Cross, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Major J. C. Mehaffey, Mr. Cortissoz, and the secretary.

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, considered the question of sculptors for the proposed sculptural groups at the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and suggest the following for the contemplated competition:

Daniel Chester French, 12 West 8th Street, New York, N. Y.

Herbert Adams, 131 West 11th Street, New York, N. Y.

James E. Fraser, 328 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. A. Weinman, 234 Greenway South, Forest Hills, Long Island, N.Y.

Leo Friedlander, 208 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.

Lee Lawrie, 1923 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. Paul Jennewein, 538 Van Nest Avenue, Bronx, New York, N. Y.

The Commission would be pleased to have submitted to them a preliminary draft of the competition.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Colonel Grant:

Mr. Daniel Chester French has suggested that the name of Piccirilli Brothers appear on the plinth of the statue of Lincoln in the Lincoln Memorial, as the fabricators of the statue.

The Commission considered the matter at the meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, and were of the opinion that Mr. French's suggestion should be carried out.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

February 14, 1919.

Dear Colonel Grant:

Mr. Daniel Chester Fremch has suggested that the name of Piccirilli Brothers appear on the plinth of the statue of Lincoln in the Lincoln Memorial, as the fabricators of the statue.

The Commission considered the matter at the meeting in New York City on February 13, 1919, and were of the opinion that Mr. French's suggestion should be carried out.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

WAR DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL
WASHINGTON

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
FEB 9 1929
NOTED

IN REPLY REFER TO QMI 613.3 C-E (Kitty Hawk)

February 9, 1929.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary, The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

The Jury of Award for the competition for the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, has submitted its report to me and I take pleasure in enclosing a copy for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts.

You will find the act of Congress requiring the approval of the Commission quoted in the program for the competition, a copy of which is enclosed herewith. I request the decision of the Commission upon the entire suitability of the designs for the purpose intended. A copy of the designer's conception of the symbolism of his plan for the monument is also enclosed. The designs themselves in five (5) drawings are forwarded to you under separate cover in connection with this letter. You will note that in accordance with the instructions of the Cabinet Commission, under which I am acting, and as clearly shown in the program, the memorial is to consist of two separate parts, first a building for the Coast Guard of a utilitarian character and with no special architectural features, to be located on the beach, and secondly, a monument in the form of a light tower to be located on the top of Kill Devil Hill. It is only the latter which gives a chance to the designer to express himself.

The name of the author of the winning design is held confidential and has not been released for publication inasmuch as final selection rests in the hands of the Cabinet Commission.

Such reasonably expeditious decision as the Fine Arts Commission finds possible to give me will be much appreciated, as it will assist in advancing the date of final and definite selection of the design.

Very sincerely yours,

B. F. Cheatham

B. F. CHEATHAM,
Major General,
The Quartermaster General.

Exhibit C

3 Incls.

Munitions Building, Washington, D. C.,
February 4, 1929.

Major General B. F. Cheatham, U.S.A.,
The Quartermaster General,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

1. The Jury appointed to judge the designs submitted in the Competition for the Wright Memorial, Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N.C. has received the report of the Professional Advisor that all of the submissions, with the exception of numbers 12, 15 and 35, have complied with the mandatory requirements of the Program, and has verified this statement by an examination of all the submissions.

2. After a careful study of the Program and communications addressed by the Professional Advisor to the competitors, the Jury has thoroughly gone over every design submitted in the competition, again and again, gradually eliminating those which eliminated themselves. The high character of the designs submitted should be stressed. The presentation of the drawings generally shows a very high standard of draftsmanship and none of them suffered from inadequate expression.

3. The design finally selected is one which stood out from all the rest by reason of its extreme simplicity. The power of imagination manifested by the author strikes one at first sight and increases on closer acquaintance. It is not only most original and impressive as seen from the land, but would also be extremely effective as seen from the air. It strongly emphasizes the dominant motive suggested in the Program, namely a memorial to the birth of human flight. The form suggests a plastic material, and the austerity and restraint of the design is entirely in harmony with the elemental character of the surrounding country and of the event it commemorates.

4. The Jury therefore begs to heartily and unanimously recommend to The Quartermaster General that submission number 7 be selected as the winning design.

5. The Coast Guard Station design included in the Program has also been treated with the simplicity and restraint, appropriate for a building for this purpose, although all of the designs have enlarged somewhat on the almost primitive character of the usual accommodations provided in these buildings.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD W. DONN, F.A.I.A.,
Chairman.

PROFESSOR FREDERICK V. MURPHY, A.I.A.

VICTOR HERBRENT, F.A.I.A.,
Professional Advisor.

WILLIAM H. LOND, F.A.I.A.

COPY

7.

COMPETITION FOR THE WRIGHT MEMORIAL

A concrete pylon, suggesting huge, up-raised wings symbolizes the birth of flight. Sharply triangular in plan, it is meant to convey the effect of forward motion and speed (as in the prow of a ship). The apex of the triangle points down the landing field, and its flat face confronts the land approach with an inscription, legible at great distance. A more detailed inscription encircles the plinth of the monument.

The pylon is set upon a star-shaped base forming the insignia used on the military and naval planes of the United States. Thus the monument will serve as a distinctive day-mark for aeroplanes as well as supporting a lighthouse and aeroplane beacon.

The existing corner stone will be incorporated in the plinth.

The carving and detail is of a rugged character, readily executed in concrete, and suitable to commemorate the bold and steadfast genius of the brothers Wright, which near this spot achieved the beginning of modern aviation.

The administration building is of wood shingles. Without much architectural pretense it is intended to reflect somewhat the simple, almost nautical character of buildings of the early seaports of this country. The lookout tower forms a cupola with a surrounding "captain's walk", and there is an ample porch for visitors to the tablet which is to be installed in the octagonal hall.

COPY

New York City,

February 12, 1929.

Major General B. F. Cheatham, U. S. A.,
The Quartermaster General,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Cheatham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City today, inspected the designs (Scheme No.7), submitted with your letter of February 9th, for the proposed Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. You ask the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts upon the entire suitability of the designs for the purpose intended.

The Commission gave the designs careful consideration and have to advise you that they (Scheme 7) are suitable for the purpose intended,-namely for the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore, Chairman.

The Commission would be pleased to consult with the architect with a view of some simplification of the design, and a closer relation between the top and the monument proper. The design for the Station is considered particularly satisfactory.

EXHIBIT C-1

Major General B. F. Cheatham, U. S. A.,
The Quartermaster General,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Cheatham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City today, inspected the designs (Scheme No.7), submitted with your letter of February 7th, for the proposed Wright Memorial at Unity Chapel, North Carolina. You seek the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts upon the artistic suitability of the designs for the purpose intended.

The Commission gave the designs careful consideration and have to advise you that they (Scheme 7) are suitable for the purpose intended,--namely for the Wright Memorial at Unity Chapel.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore, Chairman.

The Commission would be pleased to consult with the Architect with a view of some simplification of the design, and a closer relation between the top and the monument proper. The design for the Lettering is considered particularly satisfactory.

Enclosure C-1

National Geographic Society

WASHINGTON, D. C.

GILBERT GROSVENOR, PRESIDENT

RECEIVED
FINE ARTS COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JAN 15 1929

January 15, 1929

Mr. Charles Moore,
Chairman, Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Mrs. Peary has finally returned to town, and I was able to take her and her daughter, Mrs. Stafford, to Arlington to show them the site to which you have recommended Admiral Peary's monument be transferred.

Mrs. Peary is extremely pleased with your recommendation and most grateful to you for the suggestion, as she feels that the new site will be much more appropriate than the present one.

She was also pleased with the landscaping proposed by Mr. Simonds in accordance with your outline to him. I enclose Mr. Simonds' diagram showing proposed landscaping, and also a letter from him on the subject.

At your convenience, will you kindly advise me of the proper form of application which should now be signed by Mrs. Peary and presented to the Secretary of War. Mrs. Peary will sign the papers as soon as they are prepared.

Yours very sincerely,

Gilbert Grosvenor

Enclosures
G/P

Exhibit D

O. C. SIMONDS
J. ROY WEST
ERLE O. BLAIR
A. R. OLSON
M. H. COLLINSON
A. E. ROEHL
R. O. SIMONDS

SIMONDS & WEST
LANDSCAPE DESIGNERS
1101 BUENA AVENUE
CHICAGO
TELEPHONE LAKEVIEW 9772

October 31, 1927.

Mr. Gilbert Grosvenor,
c/o National Geographic Society,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Grosvenor:

I promised to send you a sketch showing the planting around Admiral Peary's lot, and am enclosing it. The front of the lot is at "B", the rear at "A". You will notice on the cross-section at the side that I have indicated a terrace of some sort to have the monument stand on a slight elevation. The proposed profile seems to me to be a natural grade in consideration of the surrounding ground on all sides. The draftsman has indicated a square base for the monument. The base may have been square but what I remember is a rounded globe.

The idea of the planting is to have a background of evergreens, and I have suggested our common hemlocks. Mr. Moore has preferred the Carolina hemlock. I am willing that either should be used; they are both beautiful trees, and I think our native hemlock evergreens. In front of the hemlocks I have indicated rhododendrons, and in front of these roses - low creeping roses. Mr. Moore has no suggestions for roses outside of the Peary lot. To the south, as you will recall, there is a steep hillside, descending to the southeast boundary, and this hillside continues in both directions. It would be fine if this whole hillside could be set aside as a forest and bird preserve, and if the character of the tree growth could be changed to that of a typical Virginia hillside. It would mean the introduction of

maples, sweet gums, peppperidges, sassafras, and the native shrubs, many of which bear fruit for the birds. Some distance east of the Peary lot there are beautiful oaks, but more should be added, and the ailanthus, and, at least, some of the locusts should be cut out.

The views from the proposed Peary lot are excellent, especially in the winter time, and they might be just as good in the summer with a comparatively small amount of tree cutting. I regard these views extending to distant horizons as very important. The cemetery as a whole is beautiful, but it seems to me to lack shrubbery. Roses, silverberries, osageods, viburnums, and a host of other small trees and shrubs would be beautiful in themselves, in their blossoms, foliage and fruit, and their pleasing twiggery of winter, and they would,also, furnish nesting places and food for birds, so that the cemetery would be filled with music during spring and summer. I would not like to suggest the addition of shrubbery, however, unless the authorities in charge are sympathetic with the idea. Any scheme is most apt to succeed when carried out by someone in sympathy with it.

On the Peary sketch I suggested sweet gums at the back of the lot. These would be on the area which should become a natural Virginia forest. Please make criticisms or ask any questions you wish regarding the plan.

I am just leaving for Quincy,and will write you another letter regarding the planting on your own lot when I return.

Yours sincerely,

O. C. Simonds

OCS/MH

COPY

February 23, 1929.

Dear Dr. Grosvenor:

Somehow the Commission of Fine Arts were not impressed by Mr. Simonds' landscape design for the new location of the Peary Memorial. The Commission would not stand for Dorothy Perkins roses in Arlington. They thought that the plan should be simplified. Perhaps the best way would be to relocate the Memorial and then arrange the planting accordingly. How does this strike you? I f favorable, we will so report to the Quartermaster General.

Cordially yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, President,
National Geographic Society,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D-1

EXHIBIT D-1

Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, President,
National Geographic Society,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Dr. Grosvenor:

Somehow the Commission of Fine Arts were not impressed by Mr. Simonds' landscape design for the new location of the Henry Memorial. The Commission would not stand for Dorothy Perkins roses in Arlington. They thought that the plan should be simplified. Perhaps the best way would be to relocate the Memorial and then arrange the planting accordingly. How does this strike you? If favorable, we will so report to the Quartermaster General.

Cordially yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

February 25, 1924.

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Mr. Lodge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12th, discussed the proposed fence for the Freer Gallery of Art. Colonel Grant, the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, was present at the meeting, and it was the general feeling that a fence on the xoutside of the lot was desirable and that the fence along the easterly side and front of the building, making an enclosure, would be eminently proper in connection with the Freer Gallery, provided the space included within the fence were treated and used as a garden and not simply as an enclosure of space. If a garden can be laid out and maintained, using some works of art in connection with it, then the Commission would regard the fence as serving a particular purpose. The Commission x is explicit in this matter because of the precedent which is now being established in relation to the treatment of the Mall.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator,
Freer Gallery of Art,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

February 14, 1923.

Dear Mr. Lodge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 11th, discussed the proposed fence for the Freer Gallery of Art. General Grant, the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, was present at the meeting, and it was the general feeling that a fence on the southside of the lot was desirable and that the fence along the easterly side and front of the building, making an enclosure, would be eminently proper in connection with the Freer Gallery, provided the space included within the fence were treated and used as a garden and not simply as an enclosure of space. If a garden can be laid out and maintained, using some waste of ~~not~~ in connection with it, then the Commission would regard the fence as serving a particular purpose. The Commission is explicit in this matter because of the precedent which is now being established in relation to the treatment of the Mall.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John E. Lodge, Director,
Freer Gallery of Art,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, inspected the model prepared by Mr. C. P. Jennewein, sculptor, of the proposed fountain to be erected at Tours, France, to commemorate the Services of Supply of the American Army during the World War. The Commission considered the model at the studio of the sculptor, and approved it, subject to certain suggestions which were made to the sculptor, and to the architect, Mr. Harmon.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,

Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, inspected the model prepared by Mr. C. P. Jennewein, sculptor, of the proposed fountain to be erected at Tours, France, to commemorate the Services of Supply of the American Army during the World War. The Commission considered the model at the studio of the sculptor, and approved it, subject to certain suggestions which were made to the sculptor, and to the architect, Mr. Harmon.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,

Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, considered the perspective and plot plan of a building to be used as a School at Verdun, France, submitted with your letter of February 11th. The building proposed is a copy of the old barracks at Trenton, New Jersey, and is to be a gift of the New Jersey France Memorial Commission.

The sketch shows a building endeared to the people of New Jersey by reason of the historic associations with its location. But the building is unfitted for school purposes; it would look strangely out of place in France; and would defeat the very purpose intended to be served---namely, an expression of appreciation and good will.

We suggest that a well-designed school building, with a memorial tablet commemorating the gift, would doubtless be acceptable to the people of Verdun. The design of such a building could be so made as to be not incongruous with its surroundings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

COPY

February 14, 1929.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting in New York City on February 12, 1929, considered the perspective and plot plan of a building to be used as a School at Verdun, France, submitted with your letter of February 11th. The building proposed is a copy of the old barracks at Trenton, New Jersey, and is to be a gift of the New Jersey France Memorial Commission.

The sketch shows a building endeared to the people of New Jersey by reason of the historic associations with its location. But the building is unfitted for school purposes; it would look strangely out of place in France; and would defeat the very purpose intended to be served---namely, an expression of appreciation and good will.

We suggest that a well-designed school building, with a memorial tablet commemorating the gift, would doubtless be acceptable to the people of Verdun. The design of such a building could be so made as to be not incongruous with its surroundings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G